

Application No. 09/342,949

print queue icon, wherein each job ticket is associated with a job ticket icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources to complete the print job associated with the job ticket.

Claim 1 should be allowed as the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Examiner must show that a combination of references actually teaches or suggests all the limitations of a claim. MPEP 2143.03.

The Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 1. For example, in claim 1, Applicants recite "a depiction of a job ticket window displaying a job ticket for each print job by selecting the print queue icon, wherein each job ticket is associated with a job ticket icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources to complete the print job associated with the job ticket." Claim 1 plainly recites that each job ticket is associated with an icon indicating whether resources are available for the job. The Examiner asserts that Aiello, Jr. et al. teach this limitation. The Examiner asserts that Aiello Jr. et al. teaches a job ticket associated with an icon indicating whether resources are available for the job. However, the passage and the drawing cited by the Examiner do not support this assertion. The Examiner points to FIG. 25 and column 8, lines 44-48, which reads: "Selecting the view report ticket option displays a Report Ticket window 198 (FIG. 25). The following information about a selected report is displayed: job name; data definition name; form used; print date; print start time; print end time; total lines in report; and total pages printed." The information displayed in FIG. 25 and listed in the passage are apparently directed to a job report that indicates the details of a completed job. The passage and drawing cited by the Examiner do not refer to a job ticket that indicates details about a queued job. Specifically, the job report cited by the Examiner does not indicate whether there are sufficient resources to complete a particular print job. Further, neither the passage nor the drawing cited by the Examiner discloses an icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources available to complete the job.

The Examiner has also failed to show that Alimpich et al. and Kurozasa provide the elements missing from the patent of Aiello, Jr. et al. Displaying the status of each print job is not the same as displaying an icon that indicates whether resources are available. Applicants do not understand how the ability to control printer functions is equivalent to displaying an icon indicating whether resources are available. The information displayed in FIG. 7 of Alimpich et al. and listed in the cited passage are

Application No. 09/342,949

directed to printer status. The "job tickets" the Examiner references do not indicate whether there are sufficient resources to complete a particular print job. Further, neither the passage nor drawing cited by the Examiner discloses an icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources available to complete the job. Similarly, FIG. 15 of Kurozasa also fails to disclose an icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources available to complete the job.

For each of the above reasons, claims, 5, 7, 9, and 26, as claims, 5, 7, 9, and 26 each depend from claim 1.

Applicants recite in claim 20, a method for managing resources for print jobs, which includes displaying print job tickets in a print queue, identifying print job information necessary to complete print jobs based on contents of print job tickets, prompting modules for resource status information, receiving resource status information from modules, comparing resource status information to print job information for each job ticket, displaying first icon indicating that resources are available to complete print jobs for job tickets, where resources are sufficient, and displaying second icon indicating that resources are unavailable to complete print jobs for job tickets, where resources are insufficient.

Claim 20 should be allowed as the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner must show that a combination of references actually teaches or suggests all the limitations of a claim. MPEP 2143.03.

The Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 20. For example, in claim 20, Applicants recite displaying a first icon indicating that resources are available to complete print jobs for job tickets, where resources are sufficient, and displaying a second icon indicating that resources are unavailable to complete print jobs for job tickets, where resources are insufficient. The Examiner asserts Alimpich et al. shows first and second icons that indicate sufficient and insufficient resources respectively. The Examiner has pointed to FIG. 7 of Alimpich et al. for this disclosure. However, the Examiner has not established that FIG. 7 shows an icon, or in any other way displays to the user whether there were sufficient resources to complete a particular job. The Examiner has shown that FIG. 7 may give general information about the status of a printer, but has failed to show that the screen depicted therein would disclose information regarding the resources required for printing a job. Further, the Examiner has pointed to no part of any of the patents

Application No. 09/342,949

that discloses two icons, one indicating that sufficient resources are available, the other indicating that insufficient resources are available. As the Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches all the limitations of Applicants' claims, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 21-25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Alimpich, Aiello and Kurozasa, in view of claim 1, and in view of Manglapus et al. (US Patent 6,219,151 B1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies upon the combination of Aiello, Jr. et al., Alimpich et al., Kurozasa, and Manglapus et al. to support these rejections. Applicants have already argued that the Examiner has failed to establish that any of Aiello, Jr. et al., Alimpich et al., and Kurozasa disclose a job ticket icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources to complete the print job associated with a job ticket.

Claims 2-4, 6, and 8 should be allowed as the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Examiner must show that a combination of references actually teaches or suggests all the limitations of a claim. MPEP 2143.03. Claims 2-4, 6, and 8 depend from claim 1. With respect to claim 1, Applicants have already argued that the Examiner has failed to show that any of the Alimpich et al., Aiello, Jr. et al., or Kurozasa references discloses a depiction of a job ticket window displaying a job ticket for each print job, wherein the job ticket window is displayed when the print queue icon is selected, and wherein each job ticket is associated with a job ticket icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources to complete the print job associated with the job ticket. The Examiner has pointed to no part of the Manglapus et al. reference that discloses an icon indicating whether sufficient resources are available to complete a print job. As the Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches all the limitations of Applicants' claims, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 21-25 should be allowed as the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Examiner must show that a combination of references actually teaches or suggests all the limitations of a claim. MPEP 2143.03. Claims 21-25 depend from claim 20. With respect to claim 20, Applicants have already argued that the

Application No. 09/342,949

Examiner has failed to show that any of the Alimpich et al., Aiello, Jr. et al., or Kurozasa references discloses displaying a first icon indicating that resources are available to complete print jobs for job tickets, where resources are sufficient, and displaying a second icon indicating that resources are unavailable to complete print jobs for job tickets, where resources are insufficient. The Examiner has also pointed to no part of the Manglapus et al. reference that discloses first and second icons indicating whether sufficient or insufficient resources are available to complete a print job. As the Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches all the limitations of Applicants' claims, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10-19 are allowed.


Claims 10 and 15 are independent claims.

Conclusion

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

A telephone interview is respectfully requested at the number listed below prior to any further Office Action, i.e., if the Examiner has any remaining questions or issues to address after this paper. The undersigned will be happy to discuss any further Examiner-proposed amendments as may be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph M. Young
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,248
Telephone (585) 423-4554

JMY/gmm